Appendix I.

Vide **Answer to Question No. 55.**

	Name of Newspaper.	*Date of ban.*
1.	The Herald (Weekly, Calcutta)	7-11-1944
2.	The Deenabandu, (Daily, Cochin)	13-12-1944
3.	The Malabar Mail (Daily, Cochin)	22-12-1945
4.	The People's Age, (Journal, Bombay)	7-2-1946
5.	The Desabhimani (Daily, Calicut)	11-3-1946
6.	The Deccan Times, (Weekly, Madras)	25-3-1946

Appendix II.

Vide **Answer to Question No. 66.**

Name of Court.	Year.	File.	No. of decided cases from which Appeals (Revision petitions) have been preferred to the District Court.	Result of Appeals Revisions.	
				Revision petitions allowed.	Revision petitions disallowed.
Village Panchayat Court, Alwaye	1118	243	2	2	...
	1119	148	4	3	1
	1120	119	4	4	...
Do. Parur	1118	438	1	1	...
	1119	234	...	...	...
	1120	175	...	...	...

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Adjournment motion.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. We will now proceed to the next item

I have received a notice of adjournment motion from Mr. K. R. Narayanan. In view to the decision of the House yesterday, he was asked to say the reason why he has put forward this adjournment motion. The adjournment motion is as follows:—

> "I move the adjournment of the business of the House of the urgent situation of public importance created by the unkind action of the Ceylon Government towards the Indians including the Travancoreans in Ceylon. The Indian labourers have been compelled to leave their places of work and suffer great hardships".

Obviously this matter cannot be discussed. But I may mention to the Honourable members of this House that the position of Indian labour in Ceylon has been very pointedly referred to in communications by the Government of India—and I believe the Government of India are taking action on that matter. Certain other organisations are also taking action on this matter.

Now, I have received another letter with regard to the Land Revenue policy of the Government and I have received a number of letters from which I find that there is a certain amount of confusion or misunderstanding on the matter. I may therefore, in view to the general discussion which is commencing immediately, make three or four matters perfectly clear.

The first point is this; It is the intention of this Government not to differentiate between the income derived from land and the income derived from other sources. This policy has been deliberately adopted by the Government and it is in general consonance with like policies all over the world. The second point is that, as far as possible, it is the aim of the Government to exempt from agricultural income tax all persons getting below a certain amount of income from agriculture or from other sources, and that is up to Rs. 1,500. This point has been pointedly referred to and argued. Supposing a person gets only Rs. 100 from land and Rs. 1,500 or Rs. 1,600 from trade; are you not making a wrong basis of calculation? The answer is 'No', because income from whatever source is clubbed together. The only thing is that income below Rs. 1,500 is not taxed. The income tax that is levied here is about three fifths of the rate levied in British India, and will be much less than the rates that are in force in many Indian States. Lastly, the point that I wish to make perfectly clear is this. Whatever the case may be elsewhere, so far as Travancore is concerned, excepting in two or three localities, the main crops are commercial crops. Regarding paddy cultivation, which alone is subject to vicissitudes of weather and other circumstances, the position may be simply stated thus: So far as South Travancore is concerned, which is usually described as a granary of the State, there is no doubt that the reduction of tax is regarded as an undoubted relief. North Travancore does not produce paddy to the extent that is produced in South Travancore.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

In North Travancore there are very few selected places that produce paddy. Others produce crops like pepper, ginger, tea, rubber and cardamom. These are products of industrial agriculture or agricultural industry, whichever way you may put it and there is no reason for differentiating that income from the income that is derived from other industries. These are the main points which rose out of letters that have been forwarded to me, and I think it is better to make the position clear.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: TIME FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE BUDGET.

Under rule 69, the debate on the Budget will begin with a general discussion and be followed by the voting on Demands for Grants. Two days have been allowed for the general discussion and the maximum of seven days has been set apart for the voting on Demands for Grants. The Demands will be taken up in the order in which they are printed in the list of Demands, a copy of which has already been furnished to the Honourable members. The Demand under III—Public Works including Water Works and Drainage may be discussed for one whole day and not more than half a day will be allotted for each of the remaining Demands.

Every member, other than the Financial Secretary, will be allowed during the general discussion stage, not more than fifteen minutes as usual. I may say this because I have received a long list of Honourable members who say that during the last two sessions they have not had an opportunity to intervene in the Budget debate and that they want special consideration being given to them. All things being considered, the best plan would be to give 15 minutes each to every member so that it will not be stated that no person had a chance of discussion. I hope Honourable members will, while not unduly restraining themselves allow as many non-official members as possible to participate in the discussion and also render it possible to give the Government members adequate time for reply.

When voting on the Demands for Grants, every mover and the official member who has the right of reply will be allowed ten minutes each and the other members five minutes each. It will facilitate business if Honourable members giving notice of token motions which can most conveniently be for a reduction of one rupee will also specify the purpose underlying the proposed cut and take care to see that the cut motions are confined to amounts entirely votable.

In this connection I may also invite the attention of Honourable members to my predecessor's ruling regarding budget motions, given on the 30th of July 1935, reported on pages 705 to 707 of Volume VI of the Proceedings of the Sri Mulam Assembly *vide* pages 121 to 124 of the Rulings from the Chair.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly